

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	1. Determine the size of the Board; number of members
<b>Description:</b>	15 members

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>1 month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b>
Probably needs to be spelled out in the bill that creates IT consolidation.
<b>Administrative:</b> N/A?
<b>Cultural: Considerations include:</b>
There is no governance group now in IT with real “teeth.” This will be a big change for departments as projects are prioritized and funded.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Dependencies include:
IT Council (phase out as the governance group is formed?)
Project Management Office (where is the dividing line between what is pushed up to the governance group and what is done as a matter of course by the PMO?)
Customer Councils (unknown)
Architecture Review Board (governance group enforces technology standards what the architecture board designs)

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	2. Define the term of the members.
<b>Description:</b>	5–year terms for all members except the CIO. Terms will be staggered

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>M</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>1 month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b>
Probably need to be spelled out in the bill that creates IT consolidation.
<b>Administrative:</b> N/A
<b>Cultural:</b> N/A
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b>
Do the terms for the architecture board and the governance board need to match for some reason? I don't know-just asking. *Coeur Comment: The architecture review board (ARB) members are typically Information Technology leaders. Therefore, the Architecture Review Board members serve at the direction of the Statewide CIO.

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	3. Identify/confirm the Board's chairperson.
<b>Description:</b>	Elected by the Board, chosen from the Public-Sector group of members for a 2-year term.

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>1 month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> Probably need to be spelled out in the bill that creates IT consolidation.
<b>Administrative:</b> N/A?
<b>Cultural:</b> N/A?
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Coeur Comment: The Chair Person will coordinate processes required between the Governance board and the Architecture Review Board. The Chair Person will coordinate processes required between the Enterprise Portfolio Management Office for performance measurements (scorecard) and business case methods

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	4. Develop a selection process for Board members.
<b>Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CIO is a full-time member.</li> <li>• Agency members determined by existing selection process and confirmed by administrative rule.</li> <li>• ITTC member chosen by the ITTC.</li> <li>• Public-sector members appointed by the Governor.</li> <li>• Ex-officio legislative members determined by the legislature.</li> </ul>	

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>1 month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> Probably need to be spelled out in the bill that creates IT consolidation.
<b>Administrative:</b> N/A?
<b>Cultural:</b> N/A?
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> N/A?

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	5. Determine composition of the Board, the attributes of the members.
<b>Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State CIO</li> <li>• 3 Large Agency representatives</li> <li>• 3 Medium Agency representatives</li> <li>• 3 Small Agency representatives</li> <li>• 1 ITTC member (paid position)</li> <li>• 4 Public Sector members (paid positions)</li> <li>• 2 ex-officio legislative members (non-voting)</li> </ul> <p>Composition will adhere to state standards of balancing for gender, etc.</p>	

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>\$50,000/year</b>	<b>8-10 months</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> Codify Board, Codify selection of Public Sector Members, Determine selection of legislative members.
<b>Administrative:</b> Establish Admin rules for selection & terms of Agency Members and ITTC Member.
<b>Cultural:</b> Balance needs of all groups (public, users, customers, etc).
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Selection of CIO, Public Sector Members, ITTC member, and Agency members.

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	6. Identify the scope of authority for the Board.
<b>Description:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establish strategic direction for enterprise wide technology standards to be developed through Enterprise Architecture process.</li> <li>▪ Advise Enterprise Information Technology Resource (i.e. department and enterprise-wide agency) in the development of strategic vision for use of IT within state government that will enhance accomplishment of state policy goals while leveraging critical human and technology assets.</li> <li>▪ Implement effective process for evaluation of all information technology spending requests</li> <li>▪ Review all agencies spending for information technology for compliance with enterprise-wide technology standards within parameters established under procedures of Board. Review is intended to result in recommendations on priorities of IT expenditures for state budgetary process including recommendations on funding authorization for each agency's information technology expenditures. <i>(Note may view following as "excessive" language... Subsequent to funding process completion, it is anticipated that process will encompass review of agency approved spending plan to insure consistency with original recommendations. Approval of critical spending on initiatives is anticipated to be initial focus of review, however, anticipated that as process is incorporated into state budget system that review of operational spending will occur.) Coeur Comment: I believe this is appropriate</i></li> <li>▪ Develop measurements of "total real IT spend in state government" and foster understanding of technology spending levels versus comparable state and private sector organizations and value of current spending.</li> <li>▪ Establish procedures which recognize the unique nature of various funding sources and the requirements of statutory mandates on agency information technology expenditures and provide alternative processes for achieving desired efficiency in use of information technology where justifiable.</li> </ul>

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>H</b>	Policy Decisions to be agreed to prior to implementation	<b>3 - 6 months:</b> Initial processes will require substantial effort of initial board but should be possible to complete within 3 to 6 months of creation of Board. Technical processes including reporting and evaluation techniques may require 6 mo. to 1 year to fully implement depending on budget relationship initially required

## Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

**Legislative:** Authorization similar to statutory authority provided in Sec 8.A.204 will be required

**Administrative:** APA rulemaking; Identification of "initial wins" and application of processes would seem to be a key to assuring acceptance and continued Senior Executive support which will be critical

**Cultural:** Recognition of technology gap between agencies and resulting difference in "adaptability" to technology change

There appears to be a need to identify key "success measurements" and insuring that efforts focus on change that will achieve these benefits in time provided

Achieving greater understanding in business operations of many organizations that efficiencies to be achieved in the "enterprise's capability" to deliver technology will ultimately (and rapidly) improve the capability of organization to meet its business objectives

Spending analysis and other anticipated requirements suggest that introduction of new business justification processes (including those affecting budget process and cycle) and those requiring additional "formality" for some agencies in evaluation and justification of IT expenditures. Recognition of need for formalization of processes and training of management personnel in these steps will be necessary

Overcoming the historical nature of efforts in this area—can turn this positive to some degree by stressing what has succeeded

*Much more could be added but lets leave the first draft here*

**Dependencies on other groups:** Not clear what other groups are anticipated in answer—i.e. are we considering others of the 8 planning teams or current groups? If the latter then these may include:

- Legislative Process including "independent appropriation process"
- Vendor Community—i.e. their existing/ longstanding strategies for relationship management with agencies
- Existing IT councils including ITTC, ITC and CIO Council
- Labor management relationships
- Other functions within Service Provider model

Approval/Authorization providers with whom agencies have/continue to receive authorization for actions in areas such as security (ex IRS/FBI etc) and funding (ex "federal partner agencies" such as Transportation, Labor, Health and Human Services)

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	7. Determine whether the Board’s decisions are “final” or “recommended”, and provide a proposal to this effect for the Governor to approve.		
<b>Description:</b> The board decisions may be either final determinants of whether an the board may tell an agency that its request is not allowed, or whether the board action is to advise an agency and the and Governor as to whether the action is advisable. Final vs. recommended status may fall into one of four constructs.			
	<u>Final</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	
Budgetary	Option 1 (Budgetary, Final)	Option 2 (Budgetary, Recommended)	
Standardization	Option 3 (Standardization, Final)	Option 4 (Standardization, Recommended)	
<b>Priority (H, M, L)</b>	<b>Risk (L, M, H)</b>	<b>Incremental Cost (\$000’s)</b>	<b>Time to Complete (months)</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
<b>Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)</b>			
<b>Legislative:</b> The level of authority may be established by action of the General Assembly, or perhaps by the Governor, within parameters established by the General Assembly.			
<b>Administrative:</b> Level of authority may affect the formality of proceedings, and the amount of administrative activity required to prepare documents, present information, and follow the appeals process. Administrative activity might also conflict with the scope of authority for other boards to administer core functions, SPAs, budgets, and objectives in a timely manner.			
<b>Cultural:</b> N/A			
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> There will be interdependencies with the various state agencies, Department of Management and Office of the Governor.			
<b>Description:</b>			



Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)

**Considerations and Mitigation Approach (**

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	8. Determine the level of interaction/alignment with the agency budget process.
<b>Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State agency information technology offers are reviewed for conformance with enterprise standard, duplication and are ranked for funding prioritization.</li> <li>State agencies include approved information technology projects in their departmental request.</li> </ul>	

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>On-going</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> N/A
<b>Administrative:</b> Develop forms, procedures, timelines and methods for the submission of IT projects and their associated review. Coordinate with applicable boards & commissions with their timelines for budget approval. Sufficient lead times need to be incorporated.
<b>Cultural:</b> Develop and provide training related to the new process.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Dependent upon State agencies to submit accurate documentation/requests timely.

<b>Description:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State agency information technology offers are reviewed for conformance with enterprise standard, duplication and are ranked for funding prioritization.</li> <li>State agencies include approved information technology projects in their departmental request.</li> </ul>
--

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>On-going</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> N/A
<b>Administrative:</b> Develop forms, procedures, timelines and methods for the submission of IT projects and their associated review. Coordinate with applicable boards & commissions with their timelines for budget approval. Sufficient lead times need to be incorporated.
<b>Cultural:</b> Develop and provide training related to the new process.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Dependent upon State agencies to submit accurate documentation/requests timely.

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	9. Develop an appeals process for decisions made by the Governance Board.
<b>Description:</b>	Appeals to decisions of the Technology Governance Board will be finally arbitrated and resolved by the Governor or his/her designee.

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	?	<b>1 month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b>
Provide code language to create the appeals process designating the Governor as the final decision maker.
<b>Administrative:</b>
Provide forms, procedures, timelines, and methods for following the appeals process.
<b>Cultural:</b>
Provide training for how and when the appeals process may be used.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b>
Seek legal advice for language to protect all interests involved in the process.

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	10. Develop performance-based metrics that will measure the project evaluation process.
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>Coeur Comment: This Team should be focusing on the Key High Level activities for ensuring that performance measurements are later defined by the Governance Board. Definition of linkage between the Enterprise Portfolio Management Office (EPfMO) and the Governance Board should also be addressed during the Implementation of the Governance Board.</p> <p>ROI Process should be used to prioritize and evaluate projects. Review and re-working of current ROI process is needed, with emphasis on key elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete Federal and State Mandate requirements of current ROI process (Budget Review through Enterprise Portfolio Management Office(EPfMO) will address this)</li> <li>2. Emphasize Process Re-engineering and Continuation (Section I- Scope) elements</li> <li>3. Evaluate Risk</li> <li>4. Emphasize actual dollars saved (actual ROI)</li> <li>5. Change "B. Strategic Plan" and combine with "Current Technology paragraph to require agencies to state whether it fits with Iowa Technology Enterprise standards</li> <li>6. Emphasize Impact to Iowa Citizens and Improvement of Service elements of ROI. (Paragraph E of current ROI process.)</li> <li>7. Enterprise Investment Governance Board (EIGB) shall review ROI process for recommended changes and shall approve ROI criteria on a 5-year basis- to allow for continuity and familiarity with process over extended period.</li> <li>8. Omit "Funding Requirements" element of paragraph H. and allow EPfMO to assess funding aspects.</li> <li>9. Provide for a "post-audit" procedure of agency ROI submissions, including quantifiable measures to determine compliance with information submitted in application. Consider withhold of partial funding until full compliance.</li> </ol>	

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>At least 18 months</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (N/A if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> N/A
<b>Administrative:</b>

Adds requirement to process submission- where previously voluntary.
<b>Cultural:</b> N/A
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> N/A

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	11. Develop transparent processes.
<b>Description:</b>	<p>A key element to any structure that proposes to approve/disprove the allocation of public monies to projects is that there be a well-defined process by which decisions will be made and complete and public transparency of that process and resulting decisions.</p> <p>With regard to the Governance board, the processes by which projects, budgets and other items are submitted and evaluated to the Board must be fully documented and easily available to all internal stakeholders and the public.</p> <p>Specifics</p> <p>A Flow Model for processes and responsibilities should be developed and published</p> <p>The ITC ROI model of project evaluation should be assessed and modified to provide the core set of processes and reports for the evaluation of PROJECTS that will be sent to the Governance board. Coeur Comment: The Governance Board should evaluate various models for performance measurements and select one as appropriate to the activities and task required for reporting and monitoring investments.</p>

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
H	L	?(System, evaluation, and implementation cost?)	3 months

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> Direct that there shall be complete transparency in process and reporting.
<b>Administrative:</b> Direct that there shall be complete transparency in process and reporting.
<b>Cultural:</b> Given the high number of stakeholders in government, the processes may become unduly complicated and cumbersome. Emphasis should be given to establishing open accountability and visibility rather than satisfy each and every stakeholder concern.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Dependency on other boards and commissions to provide details of established

practices, such as ITC's ROI.



## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	12. Determine any statutory requirements that are required.
<b>Description:</b>	<p>Although not required, the overall requirement for the Governance Board may be established in Code. The details relating to the Governance Board (e.g., composition, selection method, terms) should be established in Iowa Administrative Code. If Governance Board is established in Code, appointed members must meet the Iowa Code Chapter 69 requirements for gender balance (69.16A), political affiliation (69.16), and attendance (69.15). Appointed Governance Board members would also need to be in compliance with pertinent requirements of Iowa Code Chapter 68B.</p>

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>Determination: 1 Month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b> It is not required that the Governance Board be established in Code. Need to determine, if desiring to pay the public members, whether must be authorized in Code. Details regarding the Governance Board are better placed in Iowa Administrative Code.
<b>Administrative:</b> The development and passage of necessary legislation and administrative rules will take staff time and effort.
<b>Cultural:</b> None.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Legislature to approve any Code or Administrative Rules proposed.
<b>Description:</b> <p>Although not required, the overall requirement for the Governance Board may be established in Code. The details relating to the Governance Board (e.g., composition, selection method, terms) should be established in Iowa Administrative Code. If Governance Board is established in Code, appointed members must meet the Iowa Code Chapter 69 requirements for gender balance (69.16A), political affiliation (69.16), and attendance (69.15). Appointed Governance Board members would also need to be in compliance with pertinent requirements of Iowa Code Chapter 68B.</p>

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>?</b>	<b>Determination: 1 Month</b>

### **Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)**

<b>Legislative:</b> It is not required that the Governance Board be established in Code. Need to determine, if desiring to pay the public members, whether must be authorized in Code. Details regarding the Governance Board are better placed in Iowa Administrative Code.
<b>Administrative:</b> The development and passage of necessary legislation and administrative rules will take staff time and effort.
<b>Cultural:</b> None.
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b> Legislature to approve any Code or Administrative Rules proposed.

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	13. Develop an appeals process (statutory) for decisions made by the Governance Board.
<b>Description:</b>	NOTE from Wes: I believe this initiative has been answered by initiative #9.

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

Legislative:
Administrative:
Cultural:
Dependencies on other groups:

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	14. Develop a strategy for interfacing with the Legislature.
<b>Description:</b>	Develop of a presentation for the Governor’s proposal for presentation to Government Oversight, Rules and Administration and State Government committees, as well as the Administration and Regulation appropriations subcommittee. The charge of this committee is to develop that portion of the presentation relative to the composition, authority of and compensation to the Governance Board.

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000’s)	Time to Complete (months)
H	H	\$0	One Month

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

<b>Legislative:</b>	The overarching strategy for interacting with the Legislature regarding the Governance Board must be developed in concert with the balance of the recommendation ultimately made by the Governor. The strategy relative to the Governance Board should include a description of the models that were considered by the committee and examples where the selected model is in place and has been successful (i.e.: customer councils).
<b>Administrative:</b>	Coordination between the nine teams, Coeur Group and DAS in the development of the overall proposal presentation materials is necessary.
<b>Cultural:</b>	N/A
<b>Dependencies on other groups:</b>	Requires the support of all agencies involved when questions arise regarding board composition and authority.

## Service Provider Initiative 1 – Governance

<b>Key Activity:</b>	15. Develop a high level Mission Statement for the Technology Governance Board
<b>Description:</b>	Coeur Group Recommended Mission Statement
<b>Mission Statement:</b>	<i>The mission of the Technology Governance Board is to set priorities for statewide technology investments and initiatives, and assist the Department of Management and Statewide Chief Information Officer in developing a statewide Information Technology budget reflecting the total Information Technology spend of the Executive Branch departments and agencies resulting in improved decision making and financial investment performance reporting to the Executive Branch.</i>

Priority (H, M, L)	Risk (L, M, H)	Incremental Cost (\$000's)	Time to Complete (months)
<b>H</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>\$000</b>	<b>1 Month</b>

### Considerations and Mitigation Approach (n/a if not applicable)

Legislative: Concurrence may be required
Administrative: n/a
Cultural: will change culture of who mandates spend of technology dollars.
Dependencies on other groups: Dependencies on Department of Management and funding processes for the General fund allocations.

